



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,430	08/21/2003	Gilles Baudin	NONY 3.0-007	8467

530 7590 08/08/2006

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER

KEASEL, ERIC S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3753	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/645,430

Applicant(s)

BAUDIN, GILLES

Examiner

Eric Keasèl

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group III in the reply filed on May 22, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that applicant contends that Groups I and II should have been grouped together. This is not found persuasive because applicant has elected Group III claims, so it would appear that the argument is moot. To remove the traversal, the examiner will consider Group I and Group II to be the same Group. Accordingly, the election is considered no longer to be traversed. Furthermore, the election between species is withdrawn.

2. Claims 24-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on May 22, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 14-16, 19-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Stull (US Patent Number 3,848,779).

Stull discloses a receptacle with a body (generally at 10) with an end wall (see Fig. 2), neck (generally at 18 and 36), and dispenser device (12) that is snap fastened to the neck (see column 3, lines 42 and 43). The indicators for positions 2 and 4 and the read as the steps on opposite sides of the neck in a join plane and the indicator for position 3 is read as the rib perpendicular to the join plane of the steps. Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Morris, Sr. (US Patent Number 5,377,858).

Morris discloses a receptacle with a body (1, 6) and neck (4, 5) and oppositely disposed steps (35) and transverse to a pair of steps are the ribs (also 35). The end wall is flat (i.e. it retains its axial position) in each of four regions. Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

7. Claims 1, 4-8, and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Ostrowsky (US Patent Number 3,993,208).

Ostrowsky discloses a blow molded (see column 2, line 7) receptacle with a body (12), neck (generally at 23) and oppositely disposed steps (32). Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

8. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Darlington (US Patent Number 3,900,123).

Darlington discloses a receptacle with a body (21), neck (25) and oppositely disposed steps (27). The lugs (27) that are perpendicular to the join plane to oppositely disposed steps are read as reinforcing ribs as they serve to reinforce the structure. Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fitjer (US Patent Number 5,160,057).

Fitjer discloses a receptacle with a body (2), neck (4), and oppositely disposed steps (9, 8). The neck includes an annular bead (9). Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the

Art Unit: 3753

product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

10. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kusz (US Patent Number 5,687,863).

Kusz discloses a receptacle with an elliptical body, neck, and oppositely disposed steps (54, the transition between 64 and 56). Regarding “made by the process...”, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

11. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusz.

Kusz discloses the join plane between the steps to be along the minor axis rather than the major axis. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have changed the orientation of the axis relative to the join plane between the steps because applicant has not disclosed that this particular orientation provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well with the plane in either axis because the device would function in a similar manner. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify Kusz to obtain the invention as specified in claims 2 and 3.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are largely moot. It should be noted that applicant no longer positively recites the join plane in claim 1 and has replaced the limitation with a product-by-process limitation.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3753

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Eric Keasel at telephone number (571) 272-4929, who can normally be reached Monday-Friday. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Eric Keasel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Eric" and last name "Keasel" clearly distinguishable.

ERIC KEASEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700